

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/619,148 07/19/2000		07/19/2000	Kazuo Uchida	00631000049	1603
23418	7590	08/20/2002			
· <del>-</del>		AUFMAN & K	EXAMINER		
222 N LASALLE STREET CHICAGO, IL 60601				COOK, LISA V	
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		·		1641	
				DATE MAILED: 08/20/2002	13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Supplemental Advisory Action

Ī	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/619,148	UCHIDA ET AL.	
I	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Lisa V. Cook	1641	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)] a) The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because: (a) \times they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) ★ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below): (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or (d) \( \square\) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: ............. 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: None. Claim(s) objected to: 1-8. Claim(s) rejected: 1-8. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_. 8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner. 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 10. Other: \_\_\_\_ Ofica. V Cook 8/20/02

CHRISTOPHER L. CHIN PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 1800 /69/

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office



Continuation of 2. NOTE: The amendment to the claims direct the method to limitations that were not previously recited. Specifically the new method requires sampling from a human vein or artery (not an affected part) and LDL quantification. Before the amendment the claims merely read on qualitative analysis. The new limitations require additional search and consideration. Further the new method must be reconsidered for 112, 1st & 2nd and Art Rejections. Also, applicant has not sited support for the limitations in the specification, therein raising the issue of new matter. Therefore the amendment was not entered.